

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bec. 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 WWW.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/808,243	03/14/2001	Richard Muhlbacher	LEAR 0835 PUS	4800
75	90 • 03/21/2005		EXAMINER	
Christopher W. Quinn			THOMPSON, CAMIE S	
Brooks & Kushman P.C. 1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Southfield, MI	•		1774	
			DATE MAILED: 03/21/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	, - <u></u>						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/808,243	MUHLBACHER ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Camie S Thompson	1774					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	s				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a represent the statutory minimum of thirty rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this commun NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.				
Status		;					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amer	ndment filed January 7, 200	95.					
	action is non-final.	_					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims		,					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-25 is/are pending in the approach 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, 18 and 24-25 is/are reference 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2,7-10,14 and 20 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to by	y the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• *					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	, -,	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	arminor. Note the attached	omec Adion of John F To Te	,,,,				
<u> </u>	-2-21	140() ())					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the priorical state. 	s have been received. s have been received in Applity documents have been re (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stag	e				
Attachment(s)	_						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 		mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)	•				

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Applicant's amendment and accompanying remarks filed January 5, 2005 have been acknowledged.
- 2. Examiner acknowledges amended claims 1, 3, 9, 13 and 17.
- 3. Examiner acknowledges cancelled claim 8.
- 4. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-12, 18-19, 22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caudill, Jr., U.S. Patent Number 4,541,885 is withdrawn due to applicant's amended claim 1 and argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 11-13, 18 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Caudill, Jr., U.S. Patent Number 4,541,885.

Caudill teaches an interior lining component for an automobile that comprises a cover layer that is applied over a two-layer foam laminate as per instant claim 1 (see column 2, lines 30-41). The reference also discloses that component comprises an intermediate mat layer (see column 2, lines 35-36). Additionally, the reference discloses upper and lower foam (polyurethane) panels as per instant claims 1 and 11-12 (see Figure 2 and column 2, lines 18-29). It is also disclosed in the reference that the cover layer is a decorative layer as per instant claim 1 (see column 2, lines 30-40). Figure 2 of the reference discloses that

Application/Control Number: 09/808,243

Art Unit: 1774

the upper and lower foam panels are interconnected along their whole area of contact and that the upper foam panel has a smaller lateral dimension than the lower foam panel as per instant claims 2 and 6. Also, figure 2 of the reference discloses that the upper and lower foam panels have different material thicknesses as per instant claim 3. Claims 1, 7 and 18 are product-by-process claims. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art was made by a different process. The manner in which the foam panels bonded together does not make the component of the Caudill reference different from applicant's component. Both Caudill and applicant have upper and lower foam panels that are bonded together. The Caudill component is the same as applicant's. As for instant claim 22, the limitation "inside roof lining" goes to intended use and is given little patentable weight in a product claim. In response to applicant's argument that, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). The reference does not disclose the flexural strength of the support layer or the porosity of the upper and lower foam layers. In Caudill, the support layer comprises the upper and lower foam layers.

Art Unit: 1774

The porosity of the foam layers affects the absorption of sound. Additionally, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the flexural strength of the support layer (upper and lower foam panel) would be greater than the decorative layer and the intermediate layer being that there are two foam panel which make up the support panel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the upper and lower foam panel have different porosities in order to provide sound absorption.

- 7. Claims 5, 9-10, 14, 15-17 and 20-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not provide for the recited interior-lining component further including a glass reinforcing mat and cover fleece. Additionally, the prior art does not provide an interior-lining component further including the ratio of material thicknesses of the lower and upper foam panels is 0.01 to 0.95.
- 8. Claim 23 is allowed. The prior art does not provide for an inside roof lining for a vehicle, the roof lining comprising:

at least one decorative layer forming a facing of the roof lining; an intermediate layer covered by the decorative layer, the intermediate layer

including a cushioning layer;

- a first reinforcing mat disposed above the intermediate layer, the reinforcing layer comprising fibers;
- a support layer disposed above the first reinforcing layer, the support layer including

lower foam panel, an upper foam panel and an adhesive layer disposed between the foam panels for interconnecting the foam panels together, each foam layer comprising polyurethane; and Page 5

a second reinforcing mat disposed above the support layer, the second reinforcing mat comprising fibers.

Response to Arguments

- 9. Applicant's arguments filed January 7, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include limitations from original claim 8. The Caudill reference discloses a decorative (cover) layer, an intermediate mat layer and a support system comprising an upper and lower foam (polyurethane) layers, as does applicant. As currently written, the Caudill reference reads on instant claim 1. Caudill discloses a cover layer applied over a two-layer foam laminate where an intermediate mat layer can be under the cover material.
- 10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 09/808,243

Art Unit: 1774

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Camie S. Thompson whose telephone number is (571) 272-1530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena L Dye, can be reached at (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the Group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 6